arXiv:1607.00451v1 [math.OC] 2 Jul 2016

Discrete-time Mean-field Stochastic H_2/H_∞ Control*

ZHANG Weihai · MA Limin

Abstract The finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control problem of mean-field type for discrete-time systems is considered in this paper. Firstly, we derive a mean-field stochastic bounded real lemma (SBRL). Secondly, a sufficient condition for the solvability of discrete-time mean-field stochastic linear-quadratic (LQ) optimal control is presented. Thirdly, based on SBRL and LQ results, this paper establishes a sufficient condition for the existence of discrete-time stochastic H_2/H_∞ control of mean-field type via the solvability of coupled matrix-valued equations.

Keywords Mean-field, H_2/H_∞ control, discrete-time systems.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate a class of stochastic H_2/H_∞ control problems of mean-field type such as

$$\begin{cases} x(k+1) = A(k)x(k) + \widetilde{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + B(k)\nu(k) + \widetilde{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \\ \qquad\qquad +[C(k)x(k) + \widetilde{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + D(k)\nu(k) + \widetilde{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\omega(k) + F_1(k)u(k), \\ z(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(k)x(k) \\ \Psi(k)u(k) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Psi^T(k)\,\Psi(k) = I, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in R^n. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Different from the classical stochastic H_2/H_∞ control problem, both the expectation $\mathbf{E}x(k)$ of the system state $x(k)$ and the expectation $\mathbf{E}\nu(k)$ of the disturbance signal $\nu(k)$ appear in the state equation (1). Such an equation is a discrete-time stochastic difference equation of McKean-Vlasov type and is called a mean-field stochastic difference equation. In particular, the corresponding H_2/H_∞ control problem is referred to as a mean-field stochastic H_2/H_∞ control, which is a combination of stochastic H_2/H_∞ control problem and mean-field theory.

ZHANG Weihai
College of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266590, Shandong Province, China.
Email:w_hzhang@163.com.
MA Limin
College of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266590, Shandong Province, China.
Science and Information College, Qingdao Agricultural University, Qingdao 266109, Shandong Province, China.
Email:hbchdmlm@163.com.

* This research was supported by NSF of China under Grant No.61573227, the Research Fund for the Taishan Scholar Project of Shandong Province of China.

Mixed H_2/H_∞ control has become one of the most popular research issues in the last two decades, which has attracted considerable attention of many authors and has been widely applied to various fields; see, e.g., [1–5] for the discussion of deterministic systems. From 1998, researchers have paid more attention to stochastic H_2/H_∞ theory and made great progress. We refer the reader to [6–13] and the references therein for details. The reference [9] studied the discrete-time H_∞ control with state and exogenous disturbance dependent noise, while [10] dealt with a class of discrete-time stochastic H_2/H_∞ control with additive disturbance. Recently, the results of [6] were extended to discrete-time systems in [11, 12], where the finite horizon and infinite horizon mixed H_2/H_∞ control were investigated, respectively. In particular, it was shown that the solvability of the mixed H_2/H_∞ control problem is equivalent to that of four coupled matrix-valued equations. In 2010, the results of [11] were generalized to discrete-time stochastic systems with Markovian jumps and multiplicative noise in [13].

In recent years, mean-field theory has attracted considerable attention, which is developed to study the collective behaviors resulting from individuals' mutual interactions in various physical and sociological dynamical systems. In the survey paper [14], three examples were presented to use mean-field approach to modelling in economics, finance and other related issues. Based on mean-field theory, mean-field term presents the interactions among elements, which approaches the expected value when the number of agents goes to infinity. Similarly to [15], suppose the dynamical equation of particle $i(i = 1, ..., M)$ is described as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^M(k+1) = {} & A(k)x_i^M(k) + \widetilde{A}(k)\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^M(k) + B(k)\nu(k) + F_1(k)u(k) \\ & +[C(k)x_i^M(k) + \widetilde{C}(k)\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^M(k) + D(k)\nu(k)]\omega_i^M(k), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\{\omega_i^M(k), k \in N\}$, i=1,...,M, are independent of each other and have identical statistics law. Letting $M \to \infty$, we obtain the following equation by the law of large numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) = {} & A(k)x(k) + \widetilde{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + B(k)\nu(k) \\ & +[C(k)x(k) + \widetilde{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + D(k)\nu(k)]\omega(k) + F_1(k)u(k), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

which is a special case of the state equation of (1). The continuous-time case of (1) is a mean-field stochastic differential equation (MFSDE), which is of great importance in applications and was introduced as a stochastic toy model for the Vlasov kinetic equation of plasma in [16]. Since about 1956, MFSDEs and their applications attracted many authors' attention; see [17–19] for mean-field backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) and stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs), [20–23] for stochastic maximal principle and [24, 25] for LQG control of mean-field type stochastic systems. Specifically, continuous-time and discrete-time mean-field LQ problems were studied in [26] and [15], respectively. However, up to date, we know few about H_∞ or H_2/H_∞ control results for system (1). To this end, we will discuss the mean-field stochastic H_2/H_∞ control of (1) in this note. Compared with the pure H_∞ control, mixed H_2/H_∞ control takes the robustness and optimality into account, and therefore appears

more attractive in practice [27]. Especially, infinite horizon H_2/H_∞ control for discrete-time time-varying Markov jump systems with multiplicative noise has been applied to multiplier-accelerator macroeconomic system[28].

In this paper, we will deal with the finite horizon stochastic H_2/H_∞ control, which extends the results of [11] to discrete-time time-varying mean-field systems with (x,ν)-dependent noise. In consideration of the appearances of $\mathbf{E}x(k)$ and $\mathbf{E}\nu(k)$ in system dynamics, we are not able to solve mean-field stochastic H_2/H_∞ control by the same methods used in classical stochastic H_2/H_∞ control. Hence, this paper is by no means a trivial extension of [11]. In virtue of the representations $x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k),\mathbf{E}x(k);\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k),\mathbf{E}\nu(k)$, we may derive a SBRL for a class of discrete-time mean-field time-varying systems with (x,ν)-dependent noise. Roughly speaking, the SBRL is a fundamental tool to handle the H_∞ control and estimation problems for stochastic systems. A sufficient condition for the existence of discrete-time stochastic H_2/H_∞ control of mean-field type via the solvability of coupled matrix-valued equations is provided as our main results. In this paper, the system coefficients are time-varying, so the corresponding results of time-invariant systems are our special cases. In addition, a recursive algorithm is provided to solve the coupled matrix-valued equations.

The contribution of this paper is as follows: Section 2 gives a mean-field SBRL. A sufficient condition for the solvability of discrete-time mean-field stochastic LQ optimal control problem is established in Section 3. Section 4 contains our main theorems. A recursive algorithm is provided to solve the coupled matrix-valued equations accurately in Section 5. Finally, we end this paper in Section 6 with a brief conclusion.

For convenience, throughout the paper, we adopt the following notations: X^T: the transpose of the matrix X or vector X. $X\geq 0$ ($X>0$): X is positive semi-definite (positive definite) symmetric matrix. R^m: the m-dimensional real vector space with the usual inner product. $R^{m\times n}$: all $m\times n$-dimensional matrices space with entries in R. $N_K=\{0,1,2,\cdots,K\}$. $N=\{0,1,2,\cdots,\}$. $H_n(R)$: the set of all real symmetric matrices.

2 Stochastic Bounded Real Lemma

In this section, our main purpose is to obtain a mean-field SBRL, which is the footstone in the study of stochastic H_∞ control and estimation. Consider the following discrete-time stochastic difference equation with $k\in N_K$:

$$\begin{cases} x(k+1)=A(k)x(k)+\widetilde{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)+B(k)\nu(k)+\widetilde{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \\ \qquad\qquad +[C(k)x(k)+\widetilde{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)+D(k)\nu(k)+\widetilde{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\omega(k), \\ z(k)=\Phi(k)x(k), \\ x(0)=x_0\in R^n, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $x(k)\in R^n$, $\nu(k)\in R^l$, and $z(k)\in R^m$ are respectively the system state, disturbance signal and controlled output. $A(k),\widetilde{A}(k),C(k),\widetilde{C}(k)\in R^{n\times n}$, $B(k),\widetilde{B}(k),D(k),\widetilde{D}(k)\in R^{n\times l}$, and $\Phi(k)\in R^{m\times n}$ are given matrix-valued functions. The initial value x_0 is assumed to be a

deterministic vector. $\mathbf{E}$ is the expectation operator. $\{\omega(k), k \in N_K\}$ is a sequence of real random variables defined on a complete probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu\}$, which is a wide sense stationary, second order process with $\mathbf{E}(\omega(s)) = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}(\omega(s)\omega(t)) = \delta_{st}$, where δ_{st} is a Kronecker function. Suppose $\omega(k)$ and $\nu(k)$ are uncorrelated. Denote $\mathcal{F}_k$ the σ-algebra generated by $\{\omega(t), t = 0, 1, \cdots, k\}$. Let $L^2(\Omega, R^p)$ be the space of R^p-valued square integrable random vectors, and $l^2_\omega(N_K, R^p)$ denotes the space of all finite sequences $y(k) \in L^2(\Omega, R^p)$ that are $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ measurable for $k \in N_K$. The l^2 norm of $l^2_\omega(N_K, R^p)$ is defined as

$$\|y(.)\|_{l^2_\omega(N_K,R^p)} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\|y(k)\|^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

For any $K \in N$ and $(x_0, \nu(k)) \in R^n \times l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l)$, the unique solution of (4) with initial value x_0 is described as $x(k; x_0, \nu)$.

Definition 2.1 The perturbed operator of system (4) is defined by

$$L_K : l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l) \to l^2_\omega(N_K, R^m),$$

$$L_K(\nu(k)) := \Phi(k)x(k; 0, \nu), \quad \forall\ \nu(k) \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l)$$

with its norm

$$\|L_K\| = \sup_{\nu \in l^2_\omega(N_K,R^l), \nu \neq 0} \frac{\|z(k)\|_{l^2_\omega(N_K,R^m)}}{\|\nu(k)\|_{l^2_\omega(N_K,R^l)}} = \sup_{\nu \in l^2_\omega(N_K,R^l), \nu \neq 0} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\|\Phi(k)x(k; 0, \nu)\|^2\right)^{1/2}}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\|\nu(k)\|^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

In this paper, we discuss the mean-field H_2/H_∞ control, which is a combination of mean-field theory and mixed H_2/H_∞ control problem. In consideration of the appearance of $\mathbf{E}x(k)$ and $\mathbf{E}\nu(k)$ in the system (4), we may solve mean-field stochastic H_2/H_∞ control problem by using the representation $x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k), \mathbf{E}x(k); \nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k), \mathbf{E}\nu(k)$, which is different from classical H_2/H_∞ control problem. Taking expectations in system (4), we have the system equations on $\mathbf{E}x(k)$ and $x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{E}x(k+1) = \mathbb{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + \mathbb{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k), \\ \mathbf{E}x(0) = \mathbf{E}x_0 \in R^n, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{cases} x(k+1) - \mathbf{E}x(k+1) = [A(k)(x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k)) + B(k)(\nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k))] \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad +[C(k)(x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k)) + \mathbb{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad +D(k)(\nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k)) + \mathbb{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\omega(k), \\ x(0) - \mathbf{E}x(0) = x_0 - \mathbf{E}x_0 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Here and hereafter, $\mathbb{A}(k) = A(k) + \widetilde{A}(k)$, $\mathbb{B}(k) = B(k) + \widetilde{B}(k)$, $\mathbb{C}(k) = C(k) + \widetilde{C}(k)$, $\mathbb{D}(k) = D(k) + \widetilde{D}(k)$.

Next, based on the above equations, we may arrive at a SBRL step by step.

Lemma 2.2 *In system (4), suppose $K \in N$ is given,*

$$P(0), \quad P(1), \quad P(2), \quad \cdots, \quad P(N+1); \quad Q(0), \quad Q(1), \quad Q(2), \quad \cdots, \quad Q(N+1)$$

are arbitrary families of matrices in $H_n(R)$, then for any $x_0 \in R^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T M(P) \begin{bmatrix} x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
&+\sum_{k=0}^{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T S(P,Q) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \\
=\ & \mathbf{E}[(x(K+1)-\mathbf{E}x(K+1))^T P(K+1)(\cdots)] \\
&+[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)]^T Q(K+1)[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)] - [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T Q(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0],
\end{aligned}$$

where in the above and what follows, when we write $M^T R(\cdots)$ or $M^T R[\cdots]$ for simplicity, we mean $(\cdots) = M$ or $[\cdots] = M$. In addition,

$$M(P) = \begin{bmatrix} -P(k)+A(k)^T P(k+1)A(k) & A(k)^T P(k+1)B(k) \\ \quad +C(k)^T P(k+1)C(k) & \quad +C(k)^T P(k+1)D(k) \\ \\ B(k)^T P(k+1)A(k) & B(k)^T P(k+1)B(k) \\ \quad +D(k)^T P(k+1)C(k) & \quad +D(k)^T P(k+1)D(k) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$S(P,Q) = \begin{bmatrix} -Q(k)+\mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k) & \mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) \\ \quad +\mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) & \quad +\mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k) \\ \\ \mathbb{B}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k) & \mathbb{B}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) \\ \quad +\mathbb{D}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) & \quad +\mathbb{D}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof Since $\omega(k)$ is independent of x_0, $x(k)$ and $v(k)$, in view of $\mathbf{E}\omega(k) = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}[\omega(k_1)\omega(k_2)] = \delta_{k_1 k_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\{[A(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)) + B(k)(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))]^T P(k+1) \\
&\times[C(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)) + \mathbb{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + D(k)(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)) + \mathbb{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\omega(k)\} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

So equations (5) and (6) lead to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left\{[x(k+1)-\mathbf{E}x(k+1)]^T P(k+1)[x(k+1)-\mathbf{E}x(k+1)]\right.\\
&\left.-[x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T P(k)[x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]\right\}\\
&=\mathbf{E}\{[A(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k))+B(k)(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))]^T P(k+1)[\cdots]\\
&\quad+[C(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k))+\mathbb{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)+D(k)(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))+\mathbb{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T\\
&\quad\times P(k+1)[\cdots]-[x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T P(k)[\cdots]\}\\
&=\mathbf{E}\{[x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[A(k)^T P(k+1)A(k)+C(k)^T P(k+1)C(k)-P(k)][\cdots]\\
&\quad+[x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[A(k)^T P(k+1)B(k)+C(k)^T P(k+1)D(k)][\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\\
&\quad+[\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[B(k)^T P(k+1)A(k)+D(k)^T P(k+1)C(k)][x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)]\\
&\quad+[\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[B(k)^T P(k+1)B(k)+D(k)^T P(k+1)D(k)][\cdots]\}\\
&\quad+[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[\mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k)][\mathbf{E}x(k)]+[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[\mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k)][\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\\
&\quad+[\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[\mathbb{D}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k)][\mathbf{E}x(k)]+[\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[\mathbb{D}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k)][\mathbf{E}\nu(k)] \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\{[\mathbf{E}x(k+1)]^T Q(k+1)[\mathbf{E}x(k+1)]-[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T Q(k)[\mathbf{E}x(k)]\}\\
&=\mathbf{E}\{[\mathbb{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)+\mathbb{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T\\
&\quad\times Q(k+1)[\mathbb{A}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)+\mathbb{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]-[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T Q(k)[\mathbf{E}x(k)]\}\\
&=[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[\mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k)-Q(k)][\mathbf{E}x(k)]+[\mathbf{E}x(k)]^T[\mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k)][\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\\
&\quad+[\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[\mathbb{B}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k)][\mathbf{E}x(k)]+[\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T[\mathbb{B}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k)][\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]. \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking summation on both sides of (7) and (8) over $k=0,1,2,\cdots,K$, respectively, we draw the conclusion of this lemma. ∎

Lemma 2.3 *In system (4), suppose $K\in N$ is given,*

$$P(0),P(1),P(2),\cdots,P(N+1);Q(0),Q(1),Q(2),\cdots,Q(N+1)$$

are arbitrary families of matrices in $H_n(R)$, then for any $x_0\in R^n$, $\nu(k)\in l^2_\omega(N_K,R^l)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
J^K(x_0,\nu)&=\sum_{k=0}^{K}\mathbf{E}[\gamma^2\|\nu(k)\|^2-\|z(k)\|^2]\\
&=\sum_{k=0}^{K}\mathbf{E}\left\{\begin{bmatrix}x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}^T\widetilde{M}(P)\begin{bmatrix}x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}\right\}\\
&\quad+\sum_{k=0}^{K}\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}^T\widetilde{S}(P,Q)\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}\\
&\quad-\mathbf{E}[(x(K+1)-\mathbf{E}x(K+1))^T P(K+1)(\cdots)]\\
&\quad+[\mathbf{E}x_0]^T Q(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0]-[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)]^T Q(K+1)[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)],
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$\widetilde{M}(P)=\begin{bmatrix} -P(k)+A(k)^TP(k+1)A(k) & A(k)^TP(k+1)B(k) \\ \quad +C(k)^TP(k+1)C(k) & \quad +C(k)^TP(k+1)D(k) \\ \quad -\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k) & \\ & \gamma^2 I_l \\ B(k)^TP(k+1)A(k) & +B(k)^TP(k+1)B(k) \\ +D(k)^TP(k+1)C(k) & +D(k)^TP(k+1)D(k) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\widetilde{S}(P,Q)=\begin{bmatrix} -Q(k)+\mathbb{A}^T(k)Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k) & \mathbb{A}(k)^TQ(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) \\ \quad +\mathbb{C}(k)^TP(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) & \quad +\mathbb{C}(k)^TP(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k) \\ \quad -\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k) & \\ & \gamma^2 I_l \\ \mathbb{B}(k)^TQ(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k) & +\mathbb{B}(k)^TQ(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) \\ +\mathbb{D}(k)^TP(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) & +\mathbb{D}(k)^TP(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof In view of $\nu(k)=\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)+\mathbf{E}\nu(k)$ and $x(k)=x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)+\mathbf{E}x(k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[\gamma^2\|\nu(k)\|^2]&=\mathbf{E}\{[\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)+\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]^T\gamma^2[\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)+\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\}\\&=\mathbf{E}[(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))^T\gamma^2I_l(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))+(\mathbf{E}\nu(k))^T\gamma^2I_l(\mathbf{E}\nu(k))]\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[\|z(k)\|^2]&=\mathbf{E}\{[\Phi(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)+\mathbf{E}x(k))]^T[\Phi(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)+\mathbf{E}x(k))]\}\\&=\mathbf{E}[(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k))^T\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k))+(\mathbf{E}x(k))^T\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)(\mathbf{E}x(k))].\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}J^K(x_0,\nu)&=\sum_{k=0}^K\mathbf{E}[\gamma^2\|\nu(k)\|^2-\|z(k)\|^2]\\&=\sum_{k=0}^K\mathbf{E}[(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))^T\gamma^2I_l(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k))+(\mathbf{E}\nu(k))^T\gamma^2I_l(\mathbf{E}\nu(k))\\&\quad-(x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k))^T\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)(\cdots)-(\mathbf{E}x(k))^T\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)(\mathbf{E}x(k))]\\&=\sum_{k=0}^K\mathbf{E}\left\{\begin{bmatrix}x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}^T\widetilde{M}(P)\begin{bmatrix}x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}\right\}\\&\quad+\sum_{k=0}^K\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}^T\widetilde{S}(P,Q)\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{E}x(k)\\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k)\end{bmatrix}\\&\quad-\mathbf{E}[(x(K+1)-\mathbf{E}x(K+1))^TP(K+1)(\cdots)]\\&\quad+[\mathbf{E}x_0]^TQ(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0]-[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)]^TQ(K+1)[\mathbf{E}x(K+1)],\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. ∎

For convenience, we adopt the following notations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&L(P(k+1)) = A(k)^T P(k+1)A(k) + C(k)^T P(k+1)C(k) - \Phi(k)^T \Phi(k),\\
&G(P(k+1)) = A(k)^T P(k+1)B(k) + C(k)^T P(k+1)D(k),\\
&H(P(k+1)) = \gamma^2 I_l + B(k)^T P(k+1)B(k) + D(k)^T P(k+1)D(k),\\
&\widetilde{L}(P(k+1),Q(k+1)) = \mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{A}(k) + \mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) - \Phi(k)^T \Phi(k),\\
&\widetilde{G}(P(k+1),Q(k+1)) = \mathbb{A}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) + \mathbb{C}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k),\\
&\widetilde{H}(P(k+1),Q(k+1)) = \gamma^2 I_l + \mathbb{B}(k)^T Q(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k) + \mathbb{D}(k)^T P(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k).
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 2.4 *(SBRL) For mean-field type stochastic system (4), we have $\|L_K\| < \gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and $Q_1(k) \le 0$ if the following constrained backward difference equation*

$$
\begin{cases}
P(k) = L(P(k+1)) - G(P(k+1))H(P(k+1))^{-1}G(P(k+1))^T,\\
Q(k) = \widetilde{L}(P(k+1),Q(k+1)) - \widetilde{G}(P(k+1),Q(k+1))\\
\qquad\quad \times \widetilde{H}(P(k+1),Q(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(P(k+1),Q(k+1))^T,\\
P(K+1) = Q(K+1) = 0,\\
H(P(k+1)) > 0, \quad \widetilde{H}(P(k+1),Q(k+1)) > 0
\end{cases}
\tag{9}
$$

has a unique solution $(P_1(k), Q_1(k))$.

Proof From Lemma 2.3 and $P(K+1) = Q(K+1) = 0$, for $x_0 = 0$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
J^K(0,\nu) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\gamma^2\|\nu(k)\|^2 - \|z(k)\|^2]\\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T \widetilde{M}(P_1) \begin{bmatrix} x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \right\}\\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T \widetilde{S}(P_1,Q_1) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

By completing squares method, we obtain for any $\nu(k) \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l)$ with $\nu(k) \neq 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T \widetilde{M}(P_1) \begin{bmatrix} x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \right\}\\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\{(x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k))^T[-P_1(k) + L(P_1(k+1))\\
&\quad -G(P_1(k+1))H(P_1(k+1))^{-1}G(P_1(k+1))^T](\cdots)\}\\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\{[(\nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k)) - (\nu^*(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu^*(k))]^T H(P_1(k+1))[\cdots]\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\{[(\nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu(k)) - (\nu^*(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu^*(k))]^T H(P_1(k+1))[\cdots]\},$$

where

$$\nu^*(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu^*(k) = -H(P_1(k+1))^{-1} G(P_1(k+1))^T (x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k)).$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T \widetilde{S}(P_1, Q_1) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}x(k)^T [-Q_1(k) + \widetilde{L}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1)) \\
&\quad -\widetilde{G}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))\widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^T]\mathbf{E}x(k) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K} [\mathbf{E}\nu(k) + \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^T \mathbf{E}x(k)]^T \\
&\quad \times \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))[\cdots] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} [\mathbf{E}\nu(k) - \mathbf{E}\nu^*(k)]^T \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))[\cdots],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}\nu^*(k) = -\widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^T \mathbf{E}x(k).$$

So we have $J^K(0, \nu) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\gamma^2 \|\nu(k)\|^2 - \|z(k)\|^2] \geq 0$, which implies $\|L_K\| \leq \gamma$. Following the line of Lemma 3 of [11], we can further show $\|L_K\| < \gamma$ with the detail omitted.

Similarly to above process, we have from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\nu \in l_\omega^2(N_K, R^l)} J^K(x_{k_0}, \nu) = J^K(x_{k_0}, \nu^*) \\
&= [\mathbf{E}x_{k_0}]^T Q_1(k_0)[\mathbf{E}x_{k_0}] \leq J^K(x_{k_0}, 0) \\
&= -\sum_{k=k_0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\|z(k)\|^2] \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary $x_{k_0} \in R^n$. So $Q_1(k) \leq 0$, $k \in N_K$. Theorem 2.4 is proved. ∎

Remark 2.5 Theorem 2.4 is only a sufficient but not a necessary condition for $\|L_K\| < \gamma$, which is different from classical discrete-time stochastic systems [11]. For the constrained backward difference equation (9), due to $P(K+1) = Q(K+1) = 0$, $H(P(K+1)) > 0$ and $\widetilde{H}(P(K+1), Q(K+1)) > 0$, we can get a unique solution $(P(K), Q(K))$. Similarly, we can compute $(P(K-1), Q(K-1))$ if $H(P(K)) > 0$ and $\widetilde{H}(P(K), Q(K)) > 0$. The equation (9) can be solved backwardly for ever if and only if $H(P(t+1)) > 0, \widetilde{H}(P(t+1), Q(t+1)) > 0$ for $t = k-2, k-3, ..., 0$. However, $\|L_K\| < \gamma$ does not necessarily imply $H(P(t+1)) > 0$ and $\widetilde{H}(P(t+1), Q(t+1)) > 0$ simultaneously, so Theorem 2.4 is only a sufficient condition, the solvability of (9) merits further study.

3 Mean-field Stochastic LQ Control

Consider the following discrete-time stochastic difference equation

$$\begin{cases} \overline{x}(k+1) = A_1(k)\overline{x}(k) + \widetilde{A}_1(k)\mathbf{E}\overline{x}(k) + F_1(k)\overline{u}(k) + [B_1(k)\overline{x}(k) + \widetilde{B}_1(k)\mathbf{E}\overline{x}(k)]\omega(k), \\ \overline{z}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1(k)\overline{x}(k) \\ \Psi_1(k)\overline{u}(k) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Psi_1^T(k)\,\Psi_1(k) = I, \quad \overline{x}(0) = \overline{x}_0, k \in N_K, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where $\overline{u}(k) \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^q)$ is the control input. The associated cost function is

$$J^K(\overline{x}_0, \overline{u}) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\|\overline{z}(k)\|^2].$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.4, it is easy to obtain

Theorem 3.1 *(LQ control) For the mean-field type stochastic system (10), there exists* $\overline{u}^* \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^q)$ *such that* $\min_{\overline{u}\in l^2_\omega(N_K,R^q)} J^K(\overline{x}_0, \overline{u}) = J^K(\overline{x}_0, \overline{u}^*) = [\mathbf{E}\overline{x}_0]^T \widetilde{Q}_1(0)[\mathbf{E}\overline{x}_0] \geq 0$ *and* $\widetilde{Q}_1(k) \geq 0$ *if the following backward difference equation*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{P}_1(k) = L_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) - G_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^{-1}G_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^T, \\ \widetilde{Q}_1(k) = \widetilde{L}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) - \widetilde{G}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) \\ \qquad\qquad \times \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^T, \\ \widetilde{P}_1(K+1) = \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1) = 0, \\ H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) > 0, \quad \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) > 0 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

has a unique solution $(\widetilde{P}_1(k), \widetilde{Q}_1(k))$ *with* $k \in N_K$*, where*

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{u}^*(k) = -H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^{-1}G_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^T\overline{x}(k) + [H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^{-1}G_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^T \\ &\qquad -\widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^T]E\overline{x}(k), \\ &L_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) = A_1(k)^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)A_1(k) + B_1(k)^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)B_1(k) + \Phi_1(k)^T\Phi_1(k), \\ &G_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) = A_1(k)^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)F_1(k), \quad H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) = I_q + F_1(k)^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)F_1(k), \\ &\mathbb{A}_1(k) = A_1(k) + \widetilde{A}_1(k), \quad \mathbb{B}_1(k) = B_1(k) + \widetilde{B}_1(k), \\ &\widetilde{L}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) = \mathbb{A}_1(k)^T\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)\mathbb{A}_1(k) + \mathbb{B}_1(k)^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)\mathbb{B}_1(k) + \Phi_1(k)^T\Phi_1(k), \\ &\widetilde{G}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) = \mathbb{A}_1(k)^T\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)F_1(k), \\ &\widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) = I_q + F_1(k)^T\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)F_1(k). \end{aligned}$$

4 Main Results

We first define the finite-time H_2/H_∞ control as follows:

Definition 4.1 Consider the controlled stochastic system (1) with $k \in N_K$, where $u(k) \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^q)$ is the control input. Given $0 < K < \infty$ and the disturbance attenuation level $\gamma > 0$,

if existing, a state feedback control $u^*(k) = U(k)x(k) + \widetilde{U}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) = U(k)(x(k) - \mathbf{E}x(k)) + (U(k) + \widetilde{U}(k))\mathbf{E}x(k) \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^q)$, such that

1) For the closed-loop system

$$\begin{cases} x(k+1) = (A(k) + F_1(k)U(k))x(k) + (\widetilde{A}(k) + F_1(k)\widetilde{U}(k))\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \qquad\qquad +B(k)\nu(k) + \widetilde{B}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \\ \qquad\qquad +[C(k)x(k) + \widetilde{C}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k) + D(k)\nu(k) + \widetilde{D}(k)\mathbf{E}\nu(k)]\omega(k), \\ z(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(k)x(k) \\ \Psi(k)(U(k)x(k) + \widetilde{U}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Psi^T(k)\,\Psi(k) = I, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in R^n, \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

the following

$$\|L_K\| = \sup_{\nu \in l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l), \nu \neq 0, x_0 = 0} \frac{\|z(k)\|_{l^2_\omega(N_K, R^m)}}{\|\nu(k)\|_{l^2_\omega(N_K, R^l)}} < \gamma$$

holds.

2) When the worst case disturbance $\nu^*(k) = V(k)x(k) + \widetilde{V}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)$, if existing, is implemented in (1), $u^*(k)$ minimizes the output energy $J_2^K(u, \nu^*) = \|z(k)\|^2_{l^2_\omega(N_K, R^m)}$.

If (u^*, ν^*) exists, we also say that the finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control of mean-field type is solvable. Before presenting the main result, we introduce four coupled matrix-valued equations as

$$\begin{cases} P_1(k) = (A(k) + F_1(k)U(k))^T P_1(k+1)(A(k) + F_1(k)U(k)) \\ \qquad\qquad +C(k)^T P_1(k+1)C(k) - \Phi(k)^T\Phi(k) - U(k)^T U(k) \\ \qquad\qquad -G_u(P_1(k+1))H(P_1(k+1))^{-1}G_u(P_1(k+1))^T, \\ Q_1(k) = [\mathbb{A}(k) + F_1(k)\mathbb{U}(k)]^T Q_1(k+1))[\mathbb{A}(k) + F_1(k)\mathbb{U}(k)] \\ \qquad\qquad +\mathbb{C}(k)^T P_1(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) - \Phi(k)^T\Phi(k) - \mathbb{U}(k)^T\mathbb{U}(k) \\ \qquad\qquad -\widetilde{G}_u(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))\widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^{-1}(\cdots)^T, \\ P_1(K+1) = Q_1(K+1) = 0, \\ H(P_1(k+1)) > 0, \quad \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1)) > 0, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{cases} V(k) = -H(P_1(k+1))^{-1}G_u(P_1(k+1))^T, \\ \mathbb{V}(k) = V(k) + \widetilde{V}(k) = \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}_u(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))^T, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

$$
\begin{cases}
\widetilde{P}_1(k) = [A(k)+B(k)V(k)]^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)[A(k)+B(k)V(k)] \\
\qquad\quad +[C(k)+D(k)V(k)]^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)[C(k)+D(k)V(k)]+\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)+I_q \\
\qquad\quad -G_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^{-1}G_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^T, \\
\widetilde{Q}_1(k) = [\mathbb{A}(k)+\mathbb{B}(k)\mathbb{V}(k)]^T\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))[\mathbb{A}(k)+\mathbb{B}(k)\mathbb{V}(k)] \\
\qquad\quad +[\mathbb{C}(k)+\mathbb{D}(k)\mathbb{V}(k)]^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)[\mathbb{C}(k)+\mathbb{D}(k)\mathbb{V}(k)]+\Phi(k)^T\Phi(k)+I_q, \\
\qquad\quad -\widetilde{G}_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))\widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^{-1}(\cdots)^T, \\
\widetilde{P}_1(K+1)=\widetilde{Q}_1(K+1)=0, \\
H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))>0, \quad \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\ \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))>0,
\end{cases} \tag{15}
$$

$$
\begin{cases}
U(k) = -H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^{-1}G_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))^T, \\
\mathbb{U}(k) = U(k)+\widetilde{U}(k) = \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^{-1}\widetilde{G}_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^T,
\end{cases} \tag{16}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
&G_u(P_1(k+1)) = (A(k)+F_1(k)U(k))^TP_1(k+1)B(k)+C(k)P_1(k+1)D(k), \\
&G_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)) = [A(k)+B(k)V(k)]^T\widetilde{P}_1(k+1)F_1(k), \\
&\widetilde{G}_u(P_1(k+1),Q_1(k+1)) = [\mathbb{A}(k)+F_1(k)\mathbb{U}(k)]^TQ_1(k+1)\mathbb{B}(k)+\mathbb{C}(k)^TP_1(k+1)\mathbb{D}(k), \\
&\widetilde{G}_\nu(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) = [\mathbb{A}(k)+\mathbb{B}(k)\mathbb{V}(k)]^T\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)F_1(k).
\end{aligned}
$$

Our main result in this section is given by the following theorem:

Theorem 4.2 *For a given disturbance attenuation lever $\gamma>0$, the finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control of mean-field type system has the solution $(u^*(k),\nu^*(k))$ as*

$$
u^*(k) = U(k)x(k)+\widetilde{U}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k), \qquad \nu^*(k) = V(k)x(k)+\widetilde{V}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)
$$

with $U(k),\widetilde{U}(k)\in R^{q\times n}$ and $V(k),\widetilde{V}(k)\in R^{l\times n}$ being matrix-valued functions and $Q_1(k)\le 0,\widetilde{Q}_1(k)\ge 0$, if the matrix-valued equations (13)-(16) have the solution ($P_1(k)$,$Q_1(k)$; $\widetilde{P}_1(k)$, $\widetilde{Q}_1(k)$; $U(k)$, $\widetilde{U}(k)$; $V(k)$, $\widetilde{V}(k)$) with $k\in N_K$.

Proof With the solution $(P_1(k),Q_1(k);\widetilde{P}_1(k),\widetilde{Q}_1(k);U(k),\widetilde{U}(k);V(k),\widetilde{V}(k))$ to the equations (13)-(16), we can construct $u^*(k)=U(k)x(k)+\widetilde{U}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)$ and substitute $u^*(k)$ into system (1), then system (12) is obtained. By Theorem 2.4 and (13), it yields that $\|L_K\|<\gamma$. Keeping (13) in mind, by the technique of completing squares and Lemma 2.2, we immediately

get $Q_1(k) \le 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1^K(u^*,\nu) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\gamma^2\|\nu(k)\|^2 - \|z(k)\|^2] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T M_0(P_1(k)) \begin{bmatrix} x(k)-\mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix}^T S_0(P_1(k),Q_1(k)) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}x(k) \\ \mathbf{E}\nu(k) \end{bmatrix} + [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T Q_1(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\{[(\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu(k)) - (\nu^*(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu^*(k))]^T H(P_1(k+1))[\cdots]\} \\
&\quad + [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T Q_1(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0] + \sum_{k=0}^{K} [\mathbf{E}\nu(k)-\mathbf{E}\nu^*(k)]^T \widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1),Q_1(k+1))[\cdots] \\
&\ge J_1^K(u^*,\nu^*) = [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T Q_1(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0].
\end{aligned}$$

So, we see that $\nu^*(k) = V(k)x(k) + \widetilde{V}(k)\mathbf{E}x(k)$ with $(V(k), \widetilde{V}(k))$ given by (14) is the worse case disturbance, where

$$\begin{aligned}
M_0(P_1(k)) &= \begin{bmatrix} L_0(P_1(k+1)) & G_u(P_1(k+1)) \\ G_u(P_1(k+1))^T & H(P_1(k+1)) \end{bmatrix}, \\
S_0(P_1(k),Q_1(k)) &= \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{L}_0(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) & \widetilde{G}_u(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) \\ \widetilde{G}_u(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))^T & \widetilde{H}(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
L_0(P_1(k+1)) &= -P_1(k) + (A(k)+F_1(k)U(k))^T P_1(k+1))(A(k)+F_1(k)U(k)) \\
&\quad + C(k)^T P_1(k+1) C(k) - \Phi(k)^T \Phi(k) - U(k)^T U(k), \\
\widetilde{L}_0(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1)) &= -\widetilde{Q}_1(k) + [\mathbb{A}(k)+F_1(k)\mathbb{U}(k)]^T \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))[\cdots] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{C}(k)^T \widetilde{P}_1(k+1)\mathbb{C}(k) - \Phi(k)^T \Phi(k) - \mathbb{U}(k)^T \mathbb{U}(k).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, Theorem 3.1 and (15) yield $\widetilde{Q}_1(k) \ge 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2^K(u,\nu^*) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}[\|z(k)\|^2] \\
&= [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T \widetilde{Q}_1(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0] + \sum_{k=0}^{K} [\mathbf{E}u(k)-\mathbf{E}u^*(k)]^T \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1),\widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))[\cdots] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \mathbf{E}\{[(u(k)-\mathbf{E}u(k)) - (u^*(k)-\mathbf{E}u^*(k))]^T H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))[\cdots]\} \\
&\ge J_2^K(u^*,\nu^*) = [\mathbf{E}x_0]^T \widetilde{Q}_1(0)[\mathbf{E}x_0].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (u^*, ν^*) solve the mean-field H_2/H_∞ control problem of system (1), and the proof is complete. ∎

Remark 4.3 For the matrix-valued equations (13)-(16), from $P_1(K+1) = Q_1(K+1) = 0, \widetilde{P}_1(K+1) = \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1) = 0$, we know $H(P_1(K+1)) > 0, \widetilde{H}(P_1(K+1), Q_1(K+1)) > 0, H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1)) > 0, \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1)) > 0$. Accordingly, $(U(K), V(K))$ and $(\widetilde{U}(K), \widetilde{V}(K))$ can be computed by the matrix equations (14) and (16), then $(P_1(K), Q_1(K) \leq 0)$ and $(\widetilde{P}_1(K), \widetilde{Q}_1(K) \geq 0)$ can be obtained by (13) and (15). The backward recursion can proceed if and only if $H(P_1(t)) > 0, \widetilde{H}(P_1(t), Q_1(t)) > 0, H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(t)) > 0, \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(t), \widetilde{Q}_1(t) > 0$ for $t = k-1, k-2, k-3, ..., 0$. In (1), if $\widetilde{A} \equiv 0$, $\widetilde{B} \equiv 0$, $\widetilde{C} \equiv 0$, $\widetilde{D} \equiv 0$, the solvability of the finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control is equivalent to that of the matrix-valued equations (13)-(16); see [11]. However, for (1), the solvability condition of (13)-(16) remains unsolved at present stage.

Remark 4.4 In this paper, the disturbance attenuation level $\gamma > 0$ is given in advance, the definition of our mixed H_2/H_∞ control arises from the classical work [2]. If $\gamma > 0$ is not predetermined or in other words, we have to select $\gamma > 0$ to ensure a good trade off between the two contradictory objectives H_2 optimization and the H_∞ optimal disturbance level, this is another issue called multi-objective H_2/H_∞ control; see [29, 30].

Remark 4.5 Mean-field stochastic systems have been used to mean-variance portfolio selection [31], Social optima [25] and large population systems [24], where in these works, the external disturbance is not considered in mathematical modeling. Generally speaking, in a real world, the exogenous influence always exists. For example, in a financial market, the stock price is subject to unexpected disaster and political strategy, which can be represented by $\omega(\cdot)$. So, it is expected that what we have obtained may be useful in mathematical finance and other practical fields, which motivates us to do this research.

5 Algorithm and Numerical Example

If the matrix-valued equations (13)-(16) are solvable, they can be solved recursively as follows:

i) Let $k = K$, then $H(P_1(K+1)), \widetilde{H}(P_1(K+1), Q_1(K+1)), H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1)), \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1))$, can be computed by $P_1(K+1) = Q_1(K+1) = 0, \widetilde{P}_1(K+1) = \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1) = 0$.

ii) If $H(P_1(K+1)) > 0, \widetilde{H}(P_1(K+1), Q_1(K+1)) > 0, H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1)) > 0, \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1)) > 0$,, calculate $H(P_1(K+1))^{-1}, \widetilde{H}(P_1(K+1), Q_1(K+1))^{-1}, H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1))^{-1}, \widetilde{H}_1(\widetilde{P}_1(K+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(K+1))^{-1}$.

iii) Solving the matrix equations (14) and (16) to obtain $(U(K), \widetilde{U}(K), V(K), \widetilde{V}(K))$.

iv) Substitute the obtained $(U(K), \widetilde{U}(K))$ into the matrix equation (13) and $(V(K), \widetilde{V}(K))$ into (15), then $(P_1(K), Q_1(K) \leq 0, \widetilde{P}_1(K), \widetilde{Q}_1(K) \geq 0)$ are available.

v) Repeat the above procedures, $(U(k), \widetilde{U}(k), V(k), \widetilde{V}(k))$ and $(P_1(k), Q_1(k), \widetilde{P}_1(k), \widetilde{Q}_1(k))$ can be computed recursively for $k = K-1, K-2, K-3, \cdots, 0$.

Next, we present a two-step numerical example to show the detail and efficiency of the above algorithm.

Example 5.1 In system (1), set $K = 2, \gamma = 0.8$. the parameters of system (1) is given in Table 1. According to the above algorithm, we can check the existence of the solutions of the coupled matrix-valued equations (13)-(16) and obtain them backward. Table 2 illustrates the solutions.

Table 1 Parameters of system (1)

time	$k=2$	$k=1$	$k=0$
$A(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1000 \\ 0.2000 & 0.1500 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.0800 \\ 0.1800 & 0.1200 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2500 & 0.3500 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{A}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2500 & 0.1000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.1200 \\ 0.2200 & 0.0800 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.2500 \\ 0.3500 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$
$B(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.2000 \\ 0.2000 & 0.3000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.1800 \\ 0.2000 & 0.2800 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1000 \\ 0.1000 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{B}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.2500 \\ 0.3000 & 0.1000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.2000 \\ 0.2500 & 0.0800 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2000 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$
$C(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2000 & 0.1500 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.1200 \\ 0.1800 & 0.1000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.2500 \\ 0.1000 & 0.2500 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{C}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1000 \\ 0.2000 & 0.1000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.0800 \\ 0.1500 & 0.0800 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2500 & 0.1500 \end{bmatrix}$
$D(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1000 \\ 0.1500 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.1200 \\ 0.2000 & 0.1800 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1800 \\ 0.1500 & 0.2800 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{D}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2000 & 0.2500 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.4000 \\ 0.1000 & 0.1500 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.3000 \\ 0.2500 & 0.3500 \end{bmatrix}$
$F_1(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.2000 \\ 0.1500 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.3000 \\ 0.2500 & 0.1000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.2500 \\ 0.3500 & 0.3000 \end{bmatrix}$
$\Phi(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1500 & 0.1500 \\ 0.2000 & 0.3000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1000 & 0.2500 \\ 0.1000 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0500 & 0.1000 \\ 0.3000 & 0.2000 \end{bmatrix}$
$\Psi(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6000 & -0.8000 \\ 0.8000 & 0.6000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.0000 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 1.0000 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.8000 & 0.6000 \\ 0.6000 & -0.8000 \end{bmatrix}$

Table 2 Solutions for (13)-(16)

time	$k=2$	$k=1$	$k=0$
$H(P_1(k+1))$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6400 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.6400 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6232 & -0.0210 \\ -0.0210 & 0.6127 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6346 & -0.0112 \\ -0.0112 & 0.6166 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{H}(P_1(k+1), Q_1(k+1))$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6400 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.6400 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.5773 & -0.0790 \\ -0.0790 & 0.5364 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.5950 & -0.0801 \\ -0.0801 & 0.4948 \end{bmatrix}$
$H_1(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1))$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.0843 & 0.0667 \\ 0.0667 & 1.1117 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.1489 & 0.1480 \\ 0.1480 & 1.1925 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{H}(\widetilde{P}_1(k+1), \widetilde{Q}_1(k+1))$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.0843 & 0.0667 \\ 0.0667 & 1.1117 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.1902 & 0.2139 \\ 0.2139 & 1.2985 \end{bmatrix}$
$U(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0605 & -0.0419 \\ -0.0517 & -0.0385 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0848 & -0.1243 \\ -0.0840 & -0.1399 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{U}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0975 & -0.0525 \\ -0.0829 & -0.0630 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.1902 & -0.1908 \\ -0.2225 & -0.2947 \end{bmatrix}$
$V(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0243 & 0.0176 \\ 0.0298 & 0.0215 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0090 & 0.0202 \\ 0.0186 & 0.0422 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{V}(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0905 & 0.0575 \\ 0.1194 & 0.0769 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.0891 & 0.1179 \\ 0.1550 & 0.2060 \end{bmatrix}$
$P_1(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0625 & -0.0825 \\ -0.0825 & -0.1125 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0396 & -0.0593 \\ -0.0593 & -0.1129 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.1141 & -0.1012 \\ -0.1012 & -0.1148 \end{bmatrix}$
$Q_1(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.0625 & -0.0825 \\ -0.0825 & -0.1125 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.1286 & -0.1167 \\ -0.1167 & -0.1502 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.3248 & -0.3715 \\ -0.3715 & -0.4619 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{P}_1(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.0625 & 0.0825 \\ 0.0825 & 1.1125 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.1255 & 0.1195 \\ 0.1195 & 1.1585 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.1729 & 0.2114 \\ 0.2114 & 1.3676 \end{bmatrix}$
$\widetilde{Q}_1(k)$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.0625 & 0.0825 \\ 0.0825 & 1.1125 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.6674 & 0.4629 \\ 0.4629 & 1.3867 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 2.0130 & 1.2515 \\ 1.2515 & 2.8022 \end{bmatrix}$

6 Conclusion

We have discussed the finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control problem of mean-field type for discrete-time systems with state and disturbance dependent noise. A sufficient condition has been derived via the solvability of four coupled matrix-valued equations, for which, a recursive algorithm has also been provided.

References

[1] Khargonekar P P and Rotea M A, Mixed H_2/H_∞ control: A convex optimization approach, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 1991, **36**(7): 824–837.

[2] Limebeer D J N, Anderson B D O and Hendel B, A nash game approach to mixed H_2/H_∞ control, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 1994, **39**(1): 69–82.

[3] Wu C S and Chen B S, Adaptive attitude control of spacecraft: Mixed H_2/H_∞ approach, *Journal of Guidance Control and Dynamics* , 2001, **24**(4): 755–766.

[4] Doyle J C, Glover K, Khargonekar P P and Francis B A, State-space solutions to standard H_2 and H_∞ control problems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 1989, **34**(8): 831–847.

[5] Chen B S, Tseng C S and Uang H J, Mixed H_2/H_∞ fuzzy output feedback control design for nonlinear dynamic systems:an LMI approach, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 2000, **8**(3): 249–265.

[6] Chen B S and Zhang W, Stochastic H_2/H_∞ control with state-dependent noise, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2004, **49**(1): 45–57.

[7] Zhang W and Chen B S, State feedback H_∞ control for a class of nonlinear stochastic systems, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 2006, **44**(6): 1973–1991.

[8] Gershon E and Shaked U, Stochastic H_2 and H_∞ output-feedback of discrete-time LTI systems with state multiplicative noise, *Systems and Control Letters*, 2006, **55**(3): 232–239.

[9] EL Bouhtouri A, Hinrichsen D and Pritchard A J, H_∞-type control for discrete-time stochastic systems, *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 1999, **9**(13): 923–948.

[10] Muradore R and Picci G, Mixed H_2/H_∞ control: the discrete-time case, *Systems and Control Letters*, 2005, **54**(1): 1–13.

[11] Zhang W, Huang Y and Zhang H, Stochastic H_2/H_∞ control for discrete-time systems with state and disturbance dependent noise, *Automatica*, 2007, **43**(3): 513–521.

[12] Zhang W, Huang Y and Xie L, Infinite horizon stochastic H_2/H_∞ control for discrete-time systems with state and disturbance dependent noise, *Automatica*, 2007, **44**(9): 2306–2316.

[13] Hou T, Zhang W and Ma H, Finite horizon H_2/H_∞ control for discrete-time stochastic systems with Markovian jumps and multiplicative noise, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2010, **55**(5): 1185–1191.

[14] Lasry J M and Lions P L, Mean-field games, *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2007, **2**(1): 229–260.

[15] Elliott R, Li X and Ni Y H, Discrete-time mean-field stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems , *Automatica*, 2013, **49**(11):3222–3233.

[16] Kac M, Fundations of kinetic theory, *Proceedings of 3rd Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 1956, **3**: 171–197.

[17] Buckdahn R, Djehiche B, Li J and Peng S, Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations:a limit approach, *Annals of Probability*, 2009, **37**(4): 1524–1565.

[18] Buckdahn R, Li J and Peng S, Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations and related partial differential equations, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2009, **119**(10): 3133–3154.

[19] Crisan D and Xiong J, Approximate Mckean-Vlasov representations for a class of SPDE, *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 2010, **82**(1): 53–68.

[20] Buckdahn R, Djehiche B and Li J, A general maximum principle for SDEs of mean-field type,

Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 2011, **64**(2): 197–216.

[21] Li J, Stochastic maximum principle in the mean-field controls, *Automatica*, 2012, **48**(2): 366–373.

[22] Shen Y and Siu T K, The maximum principle for a jump-diffusion mean-field model and its application to the mean-variance problem, *Nonlinear Analysis*, 2013, **86**: 58–73.

[23] Andersson D and Djehiche B, A maximum principle for SDEs of mean-field type, *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2011, **63**(3): 341–356.

[24] Huang M, Caines P E and Malhamé R P, Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized ε-Nash equilibria, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2007, **52**(9): 1560–1571.

[25] Huang M, Caines P E and Malhamé R P, Social optima in mean field LQG control: centralized and decentralized strategies, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2012, **57**(7): 1736–1751.

[26] Yong J M, Linear-quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field stochastic differential equations, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 2013, **51**(4): 2809–2838.

[27] Du C, Xie L, Teoh J N and Guo G, An improved mixed H_2/H_∞ control design for hard disk drives, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 2005, **13**(5): 832–839.

[28] Ma H, Zhang W and Hou T, Infinite horizon H_2/H_∞ control for discrete-time time-varying Markov jump systems with multiplicative noise, *Automatica*, 2012, **48**(7): 1447–1454.

[29] Chen X and Zhou K, Multiobjective H_2/H_∞ control design, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 2001, **40**(2): 628–660.

[30] Lin C and Chen B S, Achieving pareto optimal power tracking control for interference limited wireless systems via multi-objective H_2/H_∞ optimization, *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2013, **12**(12): 6154-6165.

[31] Hafayed M, Singular mean-field optimal control for forward-backward stochastic systems and applications to finance, *International Journal of Dynamics and Control*, 2014, **2**(4): 542-554.